



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,021	03/22/2004	Nathanael F. Ehrich	RSW920040002US1	1974

48816 7590 08/18/2008
IBM CORPORATION - RSW (JVL)
C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN
P.O. BOX 90609
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609

EXAMINER

SHIU, HO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,021

Applicant(s)

EHRICH ET AL.

Examiner

HO SHIU

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-8,10,11,13-15,17,18 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20-24 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 9, 12, 16, 19, and 25-27 have been cancelled by Applicant by amendment filed on 04/09/2008.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20-21 are objected to for lack of antecedent basis. In claims 1, 8, and 15, competitive data is extracted from the client. Later on in the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15, it claims receiving the competitive data from a competitive server. There is a lack of antecedent basis for the competitive data from a competitive server. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 18 is objected to since it claims dependency from claim 10. Examiner believes that this is a typographical error and applicant wishes to have claim 18 claim dependency from claim 17. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20-21 are rejected to for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter rendering the claim

indefinite.

6. In claims 1, 8, and 15, applicant refers to competitive data being retrieved from two different sources. One of competitive data is extracted from the client as stated in line 6 of claim 1, and the other is received from a competitive server as stated in line 10 of claim 1. It is not clear which competitive data the applicant is referring to in the rest of the limitations. Therefore, the applicant does not clearly state which competitive data they are referring to and renders the claim indefinite.

7. In claims 3-4, 6-7, 10-11, 13-14, 17-18, and 20-21, they are dependent claims of claim 1 and therefore are rejected for the same reasons above as claims 1, 8, and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stack et al. (US Patent # 6,076,070, hereinafter Stack) in view of Garg et al. (US Pub # 2003/0208408 A1, hereinafter Garg)

10. With respect to claims 23--24, Stack discloses a method, system, and program receiving a contribution request from a portal server at a provider server over a computer network, the contribution request corresponding to a client (col. 5, lines 58-67, lines 43-49); at the provider server, including provider data and an embedded program in a contribution response, wherein the embedded program is adapted to non-intrusively extract competitive data at the client that is included in a page of data (col. 3, lines 45-67, col. 4, lines 1-15); and sending the contribution response over the computer network to the provider server (col. 5, lines 43-49) but does not clearly disclose one or more processors; a memory accessible b the processors; one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessibly by the processors; wherein the embedded program is further adapted to analyze the competitive data, the analysis further including: comparing the competitive data with the provider data at the client; and changing the provider data at the client in response to the comparing and sending the contribution response over the computer network to the provider server.

In the same field of endeavor, Garg discloses one or more processors ([0032]); a memory accessible b the processors ([0096], [0097]); one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessibly by the processors ([0097]); wherein the embedded program is further adapted to analyze the competitive data, the analysis further including: comparing the competitive data with the provider data at the client ([0017], [0021], [0093]); and changing the provider data at the client in response to the comparing ([0017], [0021], [0093]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Stack with the teachings of Garg in order to utilize the client computer's computing power to offload the mainframe from data processing, resulting in a more efficient use of the resources and better overall performance.

11. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stack in view of Garg and in further view of Kitada et al (US Patent # 7,216,070 B2, hereinafter Kitada).

12. With respect to claims 1, 8, and 15, Stack discloses a method, system, and program receiving a contribution request from a portal server at a provider server over a computer network, the contribution request corresponding to a client (col. 5, lines 58-67, lines 43-49); at the provider server, including provider data and an embedded program in a contribution response, wherein the embedded program is adapted to non-intrusively extract competitive data at the client that is included in a page of data (col. 3, lines 45-67, col. 4, lines 1-15); sending the contribution response over the computer network from the provider server to the portal server (col. 5, lines 43-67, col. 6, lines 1-25); receiving the competitive data from a competitive server at the portal (col. 6, lines 6-16); at the portal, including the competitive data, the provider data, and the embedded program in a page of data (col. 6, lines 1-25), at the client, using the embedded program to compare the competitive data with the provider data (col. 6, lines 1-25); and using the

embedded program to change the provider data at the client in response to the comparing (col. 6, lines 1-25).

However, even though Stack discloses the claimed invention, Stack does not clearly disclose one or more processors; a memory accessible b the processors; one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessibly by the processors; the embedded program is adapted to non-intrusively extract competitive data at the client; sending the page of data from the portal to the client; at the client, using the embedded program to compare the competitive data with the provider data; and also using the embedded program to change the provider data at the client in response to comparing.

In the same field of endeavor, Garg discloses one or more processors ([0032]); a memory accessible b the processors([0096], [0097]); one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessibly by the processors ([0097]); an embedded program is adapted to non-intrusively extract competitive data at the client; at the client, using the embedded program to compare the competitive data with the provider data ([0017], [0021], [0093]); and also using the embedded program to change the provider data at the client in response to comparing ([0017], [0021], [0093]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Stack with the teachings of Garg in order to utilize the client computer's computing power to offload the mainframe from data processing, resulting in a more efficient use of the resources and better overall performance.

However, even though Stack and Garg discloses the claimed invention, they do not clearly disclose sending the page of data from the portal to the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Kitada discloses sending the page of data from the portal to the client (col. 15, lines 28-38, which means this sends all the data to the client).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Stack and Garg with the teachings of Kitada in order to utilize the client computer's computing power to offload the mainframe from data processing, resulting in a more efficient use of the resources and better overall performance.

13. With respect to claims 4, 11, and 18, Stack discloses receiving the competitive data at the provider server (col. 5, lines 64-67, col. 6, lines 1-2); comparing the competitive data with the provider data (col. 6, lines 1-25); determining whether to change the provider data in response to the comparing (col. 6, lines 1-25); changing the provider data in response to the determination, the changing resulting in changed provider data (col. 6, lines 1-25; and sending the changed provider data to the client over the computer network ((col. 6, lines 1-25).

14. With respect to claims 6, 13, and 20, Stack discloses the competitive data is selected from the group consisting of a data value, a domain, a page position, and a

display attribute (col. 6, lines 1-25).

15. Claims 3, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stack in view of Garg in further view of Kitada and even further view of Ferreira (US Pub # 2005/0065853 A1) .

16. With respect to claim 3, 10, and 17, Stack, Garg, and Kitada does not clearly disclose the embedded program is further adapted to send the competitive data over the computer network to the provider server.

In the same field of endeavor, Ferreira discloses the embedded program is further adapted to send the competitive data over the computer network to the provider server ([0022], lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Stack, Garg, and Kitada with the teachings of Ferreira in order to notify the dealer that new information is available in order to efficiently incorporate vital information into the calculations/analyzed data.

17. Claims 7, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stack in view of Garg in further view of Kitada and even further view of Hidaka et al. (US Pub # 2004/0030687 A1, hereinafter Hidaka).

18. With respect to claim 7, 14, and 21, Stack, Garg, and Kitada does not clearly disclose the embedded program is further adapted to extract a provider page position, the provider page position corresponding to the location of the provider data on the page of data.

In the same field of endeavor, Hidaka disclose the embedded program is further adapted to extract a provider page position, the provider page position corresponding to the location of the provider data on the page of data ([0037], [0042], [0049]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Stack, Garg, and Kitada with the teachings of Hidaka in order to be able to collect information from an HTML page that is no easily read by a machine ([0013]).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20-24 have been considered by are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS
08/13/2008

Ho Ting Shiu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157